

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/000,443

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Fred H. Mull

Art Unit

3662

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Fred H. Mull.

(3) _____.

(2) Anthony H. Nourse

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8-26-03

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all in regard to 112 rejection

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Applicant's argument is that QoS is so well known that it is not necessary to show the details of how the QoS determine part receives its inputs. The ~~core~~ ^{crux} of the invention is the weighted vector calculating part, and that is where the focus of the disclosure is on.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

F H Mull

Examiner's signature, if required